

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

SPECIFICATION OBJECTION

The disclosure was originally objected to because of some informalities. The Examiner stated that certain words in the disclosure have the letter “e” missing therefrom.

Responsive to this, the specification is corrected in accordance with the Examiner’s instruction, and it is believed that the objection should be removed.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claims 1 and 4 were originally objected to because of some informalities. The Examiner stated that certain words in the disclosure have the letter “e” missing therefrom.

Responsive to this, claim 1 is corrected in accordance with the Examiner’s instructions. In addition, claim 4 has been canceled. Therefore, it is believed that the objection should be removed.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-4 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Darrah et al.

Responsive to this, claim 1 is amended so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art reference cited by the Examiner. Applicant also submits the following comments.

The claimed invention discloses “a sleeve device comprises: a main body and a retainer device, the main body having a first end portion having a hollow interior and a peripheral wall formed with a through hole communicating with the hollow interior, and a second end portion, a diameter of the first end portion slightly smaller than a diameter of the retainer device, the retainer device inserted in the first end portion of the main body, and the retainer device having an elastic element ~~having~~ integrally formed with an outer protruded portion inserted through and protruded outward from the through hole of the main body, wherein the elastic element has a peripheral wall formed with a slit located radially opposite to the outer protruded portion of the retainer device” as disclosed in the amended claim 1.

With reference to the Darrah reference, it disclosed a socket comprising a main body 32 having a hub 36 formed with an opening 38 and a bore 42, a ball 45 movably mounted in the bore 42 of the hub 36 of the main body 32, and a C-shaped spring 46 mounted in the opening 38 of the hub 36 of the main body 32 and formed with a projection 48 urged on the ball 45. Alternatively, the projection 48 of the C-shaped spring 46 is replaced by a circular opening 49 to receive the ball 45.

In comparison, in the Darrah reference, the projection 48 of the C-shaped spring 46 is not inserted through and protruded outward from the bore 42 of the hub 36 of the main body 32. Thus, the Darrah reference does not teach “the retainer device having an elastic element integrally formed with an outer protruded portion inserted through and protruded outward from the through hole of the main body” as disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the claimed invention.

In addition, in the Darrah reference, the spring 46 is C-shaped without defining a slit. Thus, the Darrah reference does not teach “the elastic element has a peripheral wall formed with a slit located radially opposite to the outer protruded portion of the retainer device” as disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Darrah reference, the spring 46 is C-shaped without defining a slit. Thus, the Darrah reference does not teach “the slit of the elastic element is substantially Z-shaped” as disclosed in the amended claim 2 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Darrah reference, the spring 46 is C-shaped. Thus, the Darrah reference does not teach “the elastic element has a ring shape” as disclosed in the claim 3 of the claimed invention.

Further, in the Darrah reference, the projection 48 of the C-shaped spring 46 has an arcuate shape. Thus, the Darrah reference does not teach “the outer protruded portion of the retainer device has a twisted shape” as disclosed in the new added claim 5 of the claimed invention.

Therefore, from the above mentioned descriptions, it is apparent that the claimed invention has disclosed a sleeve whose structure and function are quite different from and patentably distinguishable over that of the Darrah reference. It is believed that the Darrah reference does not provide the elements and objectives as are disclosed in the claimed invention.

Accordingly, for all of the above-mentioned reasons, it is believed that the

rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn, and the claims 1-3 and 5 should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Yao-Lin Cho

Applicant

Yao-Lin Cho

58, MA YUAN WEST ST.,

TAICHUNG, TAIWAN

Dec. 22, 2004